

Page 7, line 5, rewrite “are onitoring more than on account” as --monitoring more than one account--

A copy of Applicant’s specification was not available to Applicant’s attorney at the time of preparing this response, therefore, amendments and corrections requested herein shall reference the paragraph number of the published application number US 2004/0183668. If preferable to the Examiner, upon request Applicant is willing to forward an updated set of amendments with the following corrections in a format referencing page and line numbers.

Paragraph 0005, rewrite “siganal” as --signal.--

Paragraph 0006, add comma after “detection device” as -- detection device,--

Paragraph 0008, second to last sentence, rewrite “IVM process of a” as --IVM process, a--

Paragraph 0020, rewrite “onitoring” as --monitoring--

Paragraph 0021, rewrite “onitoring” as --monitoring--

Paragraph 0022, rewrite “onitoring” as --monitoring--

Paragraphs 0024 through 0049 should be merged together into a single paragraph, with all ellipses removed, with periods added to the end of each sentence, to become:

--It is therefore an object of the invention to verify alarms from intrusion detection systems using video devices at monitored locations. It is therefore an object of the invention to monitor video from an unlimited number of video devices, utilizing a variety of video delivery methods and connections from a central monitoring location. It is another object of the invention to seamlessly integrate the process of interactive video monitoring with the present process of monitoring alarm signals

from intrusion detection systems. It is another object of the invention to utilize a database to store the video device connection information. It is another object of the invention to reduce the amount of time that is required to verify an alarm with a video device. It is another object of the invention to reduce the human error involved with the process of connecting to a video device. It is another object of the invention to reduce the number of false alarms for police, fire and emergency response teams. It is another object of the invention to reduce the central station's cost associated with verifying alarm signals using video devices. It is another object of the invention to reduce the consumer's cost of having their alarm signals verified with video devices. It is another object of the invention to increase the services provided by central stations. It is another object of the invention to solve the problem of answering, prioritizing, queuing and routing alarm conditions associated with monitoring video devices within a central station. It is another object of the invention to have IVM operate without having to integrate the intrusion detection device with the video device at the monitored location. It is another object of the invention to allow the central station the choice of viewing the video on the same monitor they use to monitor intrusion detection devices or at their option view it on a separate monitor.--

Paragraph 0050, middle of paragraph, add comma after "detects an alarm condition" as --detects an alarm condition,--

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

Claim 1, line 2, rewrite "alarms" as --alarm--

Claim 1, line 5, remove period in middle of claim, rewrite "station." as --station--

Claim 16, remove period in middle of claim, rewrite "station." as --station--

Claim 17, remove period in middle of claim, rewrite "station." as --station--

CLAIM REJECTIONS 35 USC § 112

Claim 1, rewrite "the alarm input device" as --an alarm input device--

Claim 1, rewrite first instance of "the customer's account" as --a customer's account--

Claim 1, rewrite “storing customer’s account” as --storing the customer’s account--

Following the amendments provided above, it is unclear from the Office Action whether the Examiner would consider Claim 1 indefinite. On the occasion that the Examiner continues to consider Claim 1 indefinite, Applicant respectfully traverses Examiner’s rejection for “for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.”

The limitation “alarm input device” in Claim 1 is not indefinite and is known to those skilled in the arts. Further, as detailed in paragraphs [0058] through [0067] of the Description of the Preferred Embodiment, various alarm input devices are disclosed, including but not limited Door and Window Contacts, Motion Detection Sensors, Glass Break Detectors, Smoke and Heat Detectors, Carbon Monoxide Detectors, Panic Buttons, Medical Alert Buttons, Hold Up Buttons and Card Access Readers. Simply because a variety of “alarm input devices” are disclosed does not render the claim indefinite.

The limitation “customer’s account” in Claim 1 is not indefinite and is known to those skilled in the arts. When an invention involves multiple technologies, enablement is judged from the view of a person of ordinary skill in each separate technology. When the invention is complicated because of the combination of separate technologies, an Examiner may not assert that the application must include a more detailed explanation of how to make and use it.

CLAIM REJECTIONS 35 USC § 103

Applicant hereby respectfully and generally traverses Examiner’s rejections under 35 USC §103.

More particularly, Applicant reiterates and points out the following arguments which support the patentability of the presently disclosed invention, as previously communicated in an email message forwarded by Applicant directly to the Examiner on March 2, 2006.

Although many of the devices used to deliver alarm signals and video are similar, there are major differences in the processes used which produce dissimilar results.

Patent no. 6,798,344 accepts the prior works of a “conventional security alarm system with video capability” as an acceptable, working method and utilizes the conventional process as

the foundation of its claims. This would only be true if a separate central station was built rather than integrating video devices with existing central stations. This patent adds to the conventional process the ability to forward live streaming video to emergency response agencies. This patent is a “Security Alarm System and a Method with real-time streaming video” designed to provide emergency response agencies and their personal access to the video at a secured location. This patent is a stand alone system which cannot be integrated with existing central station monitoring processes, because streaming video is so bandwidth intensive it cannot be integrated with existing central stations.

The presently disclosed invention is a *process*, which is different from the process of the “conventional security alarm system with video capability”. The presently disclosed invention is a process designed to be integrated with existing central stations monitoring rather than implemented as a stand alone system. A comparison of broadcast television that could be watched on a TV in real time to the same broadcast watched on an Internet website upon demand would be an analogy between Patent no. 6,798,344.

Existing Central stations monitor between 1500 and 250,000 alarm panels simultaneously. The security monitoring industry maintains protocols enacted to ensure the alarm reaches the central station. Over utilization of bandwidth whether caused by monitoring too many accounts or not maintaining enough incoming phone lines is prohibited. This is the exact reason existing central station software manufacturers never integrated streaming video into their software applications. There are central stations who operate using the process outlined by Faulkner as prior art. They had to create a new system as outlined by Faulkner. However, this method could not be used by existing central stations because they wanted an integrated solution rather than a separate stand alone system.

The presently disclosed invention is different because it is a process which provides a solution for integrating video devices with existing central stations. The process is interactive (with the central stations software and/or the operator) and requires either the central station software or the operator to request the video (on demand) to be viewed.

Faulkner did not mention providing video to the central station operator. In fact, by mentioning the word *secure* Faulkner is referencing when a *password* must be entered by the appropriate emergency response agencies, (i.e. fire, police or medical response rather than the central station). Faulkner states “[t]he present invention enhances security alarm systems and services by providing secure real time video for the appropriate emergency response agency or agencies. When Faulkner mentions the central station, it is referring to the central stations, as a component in a conventional security alarm system with video capability.

In our presently disclosed invention, both the video device and the central stations necessarily need to be modified to implement the process of the central station connecting to the device and requesting the video after receiving the alarm. This is why we had to teach major central station software manufacturers our process of how to integrate the video devices with their current process.